

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action mailed on July 31, 2006. Claims 3-12, 14-21 and 23 are now pending. By this amendment, claims 1 and 22 have been canceled and claims 3, 8-10 and 14-18 have been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the determination that the declarations filed on June 16, 2006 overcome U.S. Patent No. 6,611,814 to Lee et al.

In the outstanding Office Action, independent claims 1, 18 and 23 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,125,352 of Franklin et al. (“Franklin et al.”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

To simplify issues, independent claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice of presenting that claim in a continuing application. Thus, by this amendment, independent claims 18 and 23 are the only independent claims now pending. Claim 18 has been amended to more particularly recite that interacting with one or more selection cells is to “select one or more cells” and thereby define a set of intended gift recipients.

Franklin et al. describe a commerce system that operates with a downloaded component referred to as a “commerce client.” The commerce client of Franklin et al. includes a shopping basket object, a wallet object, and an address book object which interact so as to enable a customer to, among other things, select an address for use in completing a purchase transaction. These objects are part of a component object model which cooperate to enable a purchase transaction; however, these objects do not cooperate to define a selection template as claimed. In particular, Franklin et al. does not describe an arrangement in which gift items could possibly be selected for delivery to multiple customers at different addresses in any one transaction because Franklin et al. do not disclose a “matrix of selection cells” as recited in claims 18 and 23. The Examiner cites to col. 16, line 38 through col. 17, line 25 and Table 2 as disclosing this feature, but that portion of Franklin et al. concerns the data structure of a shopping basket and is not understood

as disclosing or even hinting at a commerce arrangement in which there is a matrix with intersecting elements that define selection cells used for defining a set of gift recipients. For this reason, the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, Franklin et al. does not describe interacting with selection cells of a matrix so as to “define a set of intended gift recipients.” This provides another reason why the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

In contrast to Franklin et al., independent claims 18 and 23 recite the display within a browser of a selection form which includes a “matrix of selection cells” defined at the intersection of gift items and potential gift recipients. The matrix recited in the independent claims enables interaction by a user with the browser so as to associate gift items with multiple persons. Thus, the method steps recited in these claims have address book entries and gift items from a host server coordinated in a matrix of selection cells to facilitate purchases of gift items for delivery to these persons. Neither Franklin et al. nor any of the other references of record describe a matrix so displayed which enables user interaction to select cells from the matrix and thereby define a set of gift items, or constructing such a matrix (claim 23).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

Dated:

November 29, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David Leason

Registration No.: 36,195
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant